



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

THE FOURTEENTH EDITION OF GESENIUS-BUHL'S  
DICTIONARY.

*Gesenius: Hebr. und aram. Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament, in Verbindung mit H. ZIMMERN, bearbeitet von FR. BUHL. 14. Aufl. Leipzig, 1905 (F. C. W. Vogel).*

THE new edition of Gesenius's dictionary<sup>1</sup> before us represents a further substantial advance upon all its predecessors. Besides turning to account the enormous lexical and exegetic literature of a specialist character that has appeared in recent years, the editor has also subjected the entire material to a thorough revision. The new additions include, in the first place, the vocabulary of the Hebrew fragments of Sirach, a treatment of all articles touching on Egyptian by W. Max Müller, as well as a separate though very small list of words first found by conjecture<sup>2</sup>. The Assyriological material was revised and supplemented by Zimmern. Despite the increase in contents, the work has been reduced by about six sheets in size, by a device of the printer's art. The work has thus gained in distinctness, as all philological comparisons and literary references are made to stand out clear by the use of smaller type.

A perusal of the dictionary enables the writer to make the following corrections or additions: 82 a בחר = *prüfen* (test), also Sir. xxxvii. 28, see *O.L.Z.*, V, 494.—115 b גבש, also *Neo-Heb.* as verb and in derivatives (Levy, I, 298 a).—187 a, l. 5 from below, *R.É.J.*, XIV, 152, read 157.—214 a, l. 14 *hêmetu* read *himêtu*.—400 a, l. 21 מְרִית read שְׁנָה.—476 b, l. 27 יִשְׁגֹּן read יִשְׁגֹּן and שְׁנָה read שְׁנָה.—491 b, l. 17 from below סחרי ירך read סחריך.—511 b עגן, in *Neo-Heb.* an expression in marriage law, to prevent a woman from getting married again.—558 a, l. 17 from below רַחם read רָחַם.—697 b, s. v. רָחַם II, the source is missing (Gen. x. 12).—737 b שִׁגַּל, according to Peiser a loan-word from Babylonian, *ša ekalli*.—748 b, l. 10 from below שְׁחָדָה read שְׁחָדָה.—795 b, l. 13 חֲבִלֵיתָם read *Luzzatto* חֲבִילֵיתָם.—906 a, l. 15 חֲמִישׁ II, read חֲמִישׁ.

The following lexical<sup>3</sup> and critical remarks are offered as a small contribution to a future edition.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. notice of thirteenth edition, *J. Q. R.*, XI, 688-90.

<sup>2</sup> In the list is missing, e.g., the verb שָׁמַח, which is quoted 719 b, l. 12 from below (on Isa. ix. 16).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. also my "Babylonisch-biblische Glossen," just published in *O.L.Z.* (VIII, 125-9, 179-83. Also separately), to which the above may partly be regarded as a supplement.

## I. LEXICAL REMARKS.

## בג

Ezek. xxv. 7 לָבַנ לְגוּיִם וְנִתְחַיֵּךְ לָבַנ does not seem to me to be a mere mistake in writing for לָבוּ, but a learned scribe of a later period may, with a thought of the Persian *bagha*, "share" (which is also found in פֶּתִיבָנָה), have altered לָבוּ into לָבַנ.

## ברית = biritu

Ezek. xx. 37 הַשְׁבַּט וְהַבְּאִתִּי אֶתְכֶם בַּמִּסְרָה. הַבְּרִית. The word ברית is difficult here to understand; it does not agree with the parallelism, is missing in LXX, and is deleted by Cornill. But how is the occurrence of the word just in this passage of the text to be explained? I consider it to be a later explanatory *Babylonian* gloss = *biritu*, "fetter,"<sup>1</sup> on מִסְרָה, which should therefore be read מִסְרֹה, a reading that actually gives good sense and suits the parallelism. On the expression הַבִּיא בַּמִּסְרָה cf. (Ps. cv. 18) בְּרוּל בָּאָה נַפְשִׁי. In any case the article in הַבְּרִית remains surprising, though it could have been added later, after the gloss had intruded into the text.

## גרע

In the obscure passage, Job xxxvi. 27 בִּי יִגְרַע נֹטְפֵי מַיִם גִּרַע seems like the Arabic جَرَعَ to have the meaning "to sip, suck in." The sense is: God sucks in the water-drops and then gives them forth purified (יִקְוִי) in the form of rain.

## חֲשֵׁךְ

I think I can prove the existence of a word hitherto overlooked, חֲשֵׁךְ "failure of speech," ἀφασία, in Job xxxvii. 19. Whilst חֲשֵׁךְ "darkness" is altogether unsuitable here, the verse at once becomes clear when we read חֲשֵׁךְ (from חֲשֵׁךְ, as in Isa. lviii. 1 חֲשֵׁךְ אֶל תַּחֲשֵׁךְ) "We could not speak, as speech failed us." Cf. vii. 11 לֹא אֶחֱשֵׁךְ פִּי; xvi. 5 וְנִיר שִׁפְתֵי יַחֲשֵׁךְ. Another expression for failure of speech occurs Job xxxii. 15 הֶעֱתִיקוּ מֵהֶם מַלְאִכִּים.

## ילפת

The word יִלְפֹּת "tetter" has no derivation either in Hebrew or in the kindred languages. Perhaps it is to be derived from לָפַת "to clasp round," and should then be vocalized יִלְפֹּת (like יִצְהָר) or יִלְפֹּת (like יִלְפֹּת). This is how the ancients seem to have understood the word, too, as the Midrash Ruth Rabba explains יִלְפֹת.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. O.L.Z., VIII, 129, where I explain לְמַשְׁעִי (Ezek. xvi. 4) as a Babylonian gloss (from *mašā'u* = "to rub in") on הַמְלִיחָה.

(iii. 8) by לפתחו כחזוית. The Massoretic vocalization יִלְפֹּת is probably given only according to the analogy of the neighbouring יִבְלֹת in Lev. xxii. 22.

### מעט

מעט is almost completely missing in the dialects<sup>1</sup>. One does not go wrong when one compares it with the Assyrian root of similar meaning, *matû*, which would therefore be מַטֵּע. With regard to the metathesis cf. וַעֲוֶה for וַעֲוֶה (also with ע).

### המריא

The expositors have long ago pointed out that the word וּמְרִיא, Isa. xi. 6, spoils the parallelism, and that a verb should rather be expected in its place. Marti reads רָעִים, Duhm יִבְרָא. I propose, without altering any root-letter, the reading יִמְרֵא: "Calf and young lion shall be fed together"<sup>2</sup>. In *Neo-Heb.* הַמְרִיא is especially used for the feeding of calves<sup>3</sup>. LXX ἄμα βοσκαθήσονται probably still had the right reading, but no longer understood the rare word, and therefore, according to the text, translated by "pasturing." Only later did a *diaskeuast*, by examining the original, render the supposed untranslated וּמְרִיא by ταῦπος, but inserted it in the wrong place (*before* instead of *after* καὶ λέων). The origin of the error וּמְרִיא for יִמְרֵא is explained most naturally, when one bears in mind that the vocalic endings were often not written at all, so that יִמְרֵא could easily be read וּמְרֵא.

### מִשָּׁךְ = to acquire

Ex. xii. 21 מִשְׁכּוּ וְקָחוּ לָכֶם, the verb מִשָּׁךְ seems as in *Neo-Heb.* to have the meaning of "to acquire," which has so far been known in the Old Testament only in מִשָּׁךְ, Job xxviii. 18, and perhaps also occurs in Ezek. xxxii. 20.

### סנפיר

סִנְפִּיר "fin" is perhaps identical with סַפִּיר "sapphire." The designation would then rest on a correct observation of the fish found under water. As סַפִּיר (according to Lagarde, *Ges. Abh.*, 72) is the Indian *çanipriya*, then the נ in סנפיר would also be explained, which is also preserved in the Rabbinical סנפירינן "Sapphir."

### סֶפֶר

Jer. xxxvi. 23 בַּתֶּעַר הַסֶּפֶר is striking inasmuch as תֶּעַר occurs everywhere only as "razor," whilst the penknife is not mentioned at all

<sup>1</sup> Jew. Aram. אַמְעַט "to diminish" is only a Hebraism.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. v. 7 וְיִאֲכַל חֵבֶן.

<sup>3</sup> Mishna Sabbath, 24, 3 הַעֲנִילִים אֵם מְמַרִּים. That מְמַרִּים here is only inaccurate orthography for מְמַרְיִים is shown by the variant מַמְרִיִּים. The Assy. *šumrû* also means "to make fat."

in the Old Testament. Hence I conjecture that הַפָּפֶר should be read: "with the razor of the *barber*." There is a perfect parallel to the expression תַּעַר הַפָּפֶר in Ezek. v. 1 תַּעַר הַנִּלְכָּיִים. From the fact that the Jews borrowed both the Aramaic פָּפֶר as well as the Assyrian נִלְכָּ, it seems to follow that they had no Hebrew word for "barber."

## סרן

The architectural expression סרני נחשת (1 Ki. vii. 30), which occurs only once, and is also found in Aramaic, is probably a loan-word from *šurinnu* "pillar" (Delitzsch, *Handwörterb.*, 691 a).

## סתר II

Besides סֵתֶר "secrecy" there seems to have existed a second word סִתָּר, entirely different etymologically, which means "cleft," and belongs to Arab. سَتَر: Cant. ii. 14 בסתר המדרנה parallel to בחוני הסלע, and perhaps 1 Sam. xxv. 20. The ס for the expected ש, which is still found in the verb שָׁתַר, 1 Sam. v. 9, may be based on a popular etymological assimilation to the root סתר, and is also found in *Neo-Hebrew*, where סתר means "to destroy," and figuratively "to refute."

## עו (as a musical expression)

In a number of passages עו seems to be an expression for a particular kind of singing or music: in the first place, in בכלי עו (2 Chr. xxx. 21). I conjecture the same expression to have a like meaning in עו בכל עו ודוד מכרכר (2 Sam. vi. 14), for which LXX has *ἐν ὀργάνοις ἡμμοσμένοις*, and in the evidently corrupt passage עו ובשירים ובכנרות ונו (1 Chr. xiii. 8). In the parallel passage (2 Sam. vi. 5) we have instead עצי ברושים בכל עו, which also indirectly supports my assumption, inasmuch as it is thereby proved, that the name of a musical instrument must have stood here, just as LXX (but here, not in the passage of Chronicles) has *ἐν ὀργάνοις ἡμμοσμένοις*. In the thrice occurring יה עוי חומרת, the word עו clearly has a musical denotation, probably also in עו תנו עו (Ps. lxviii. 35), which stands parallel to שירו and זמרו, and which has an analogy in נתן קול as in נתן תה (Ps. lxxxi. 3) and נתן נעימה (Sir. xlv. 9)<sup>2</sup>. Perhaps also in Ps. cv. 4 (= 1 Chr. xvi. 11) we should read ועו for ועו "sing aloud." The LXX also conceives עו here as an imperative. Finally, in Ps. lix. 18 also,

<sup>1</sup> Used also in the Mishna (Sabbath, i. 2, &c.).

<sup>2</sup> The usual explanation hitherto given, "Give strength unto the Lord," i. e. acknowledge his strength, is very problematical, because נתן עו is otherwise only found with the meaning "to bestow strength" (as in the following verse, נתן עו והעצמות לעם).

אזמרה, עוי אליך there seems to be the musical signification of the word, which, however, the ancients no longer understood, as is shown by v. 10, which is intended to be an improvement on our passage. In conclusion it should be mentioned that עו is quite generally used of a great sound, e. g., Ps. lxviii. 34, עו קול of thunder.

### עצב = nerve

I should like to explain Job ix. 28 עצבתי כל יגדתי according to the *Neo-Hebrew* עצב "nerve": "I shudder in every nerve." On the construction cf. Jer. v. 19, where מעי and קירות are to be explained with LXX as accusatives.

### ערכך

According to many expositors for בערכך (Lev. viii. 15 ff., &c.) we should read בַּעֲרֶכְךָ (reduplicated form of ערך). A parallel formation would be the Babylonian *alkaktu* (from *alaku*) = "heroic journey."

### צלפחד

The vocalization of the proper name צִלְפָּחַד is quite unintelligible. After Nöldeke's explanation (*Untersuchungen*, 89 Anm.) of the name as *theophor* (= צֶל פַּחַד), it is probable that we have here vowel-change with a purpose, as in יהוה, מִדְּיָן<sup>1</sup>, especially as we have here the same vowel-sequence (*e-o-a*).

### שלה

In Dan. iii. 29, for שלה ketib we should probably read שִׁלָּה, *abuse*, *slander*, like the Syriac ܫܠܐ with many derivatives (also Targ. Job xxvii. 23 MS. and Targ. Prov. passim). Also in Dan. vii. 25 יִסְלֵא seems to have stood for יִבְלֵא, which very well suits the parallel passage : ומלך לצד עליא ימלל.

### תימרות עשן

The twice occurring תימרות עשן (Joel iii. 3, Cant. iii. 6) is generally derived from תָּמַר. But the vocalization is inexplicable. I assign it (as a *loan-word*) to a derivative from Babyl. *amâru*, "to look" (*bât tamartî* = "observatory"), so that it really means "signal," which would suit Joel iii. 3 very well. Thus the word belongs to תמרורים "finger-post" (Jer. xxxi. 21), which Barth (*Z.A.*, III, 60) has already rightly assigned to *amâru*. The *Neo-Heb.* תָּמַר "to ascend straight" (of smoke or light) would then be a denominative from תימרות (not from תָּמַר).

<sup>1</sup> See my remark, *O.L.Z.*, 1905, 129.

תהומות = *Tiâmat*

To the numerous passages already collected by Gunkel and Zimmer<sup>1</sup>, in which תהום = *Tiâmat*, I should also like to add Ps. cxlviii. 7 תנינים וכל תהומות. Beside תנינים the word תהומות cannot well have the meaning of "floods," "depths": more likely "sea-monsters" must be meant. Even if in the Babylonian *Tiâmat* is only a *nomen proprium* and denotes the one primitive monster, yet the word after being borrowed in Hebrew can have become an appellative, denoting sea-monster generally, so that one could form a plural of it: cf. Lam. iv. 10 לברות, plur. of לברה = *Labartu*, see *O.L.Z.*, 1903, 244.

## II. TEXT CRITICISM.

Is. xlii. 3 יוציא מִשָּׁפֶט לְאֶמֶת is difficult to explain syntactically. Every difficulty is removed if one vocalizes לְאֶמֶת, whereby the sentence becomes completely parallel with ver. 1 מִשָּׁפֶט לְנוֹרָא יוציא. The reverse change is found in Sir. iv. 15, where the Gk. reads אֶמֶת for אֶמֶת.

Jer. ii. 22 עוֹנֵן נִכְתָּם was already the reading of LXX, but the translator rightly felt that not the sin but the sinner is aspersed, and therefore turned the sentence *κακηλιώσας ἐν ταῖς ἀδικίαις σου*. I think that נִכְתָּם is a mistake for נִחְתָּם, due to a confusion of sound. Cf. Job xiv. 17 בַּצִּרֹר פִּשְׁעִי חֲתוּם, and Deut. xxxii. 34 הֲלֹא הוּא כְמוֹם עֲמִרֵי חֲתוּם בְּאוֹצְרוֹתֵי. Similarly Sir. xvii. 22, Syr. ܩܡܠܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ.

Jer. x. 4 יִפְּהִי בִכְסֵי וּבִזְכֹּה יִפְּהִי I should like, despite LXX, to emend into יִצְפְּהִי, which is supported by Pesh. ܡܢ ܡܢܝܢ and Targ. מחפִּי לִיה, and has a parallel in Isa. xxx. 22, where in a similar connexion there is mention of the יִצְפִּי of idols. The Piel of יִפֵּה is otherwise not verified in the Old Testament, and the interchange of צ and פ is explained through the similarity of the letters in the early Hebrew alphabet. Cf. infra on Ps. lxviii. 5 and 19, and Isa. xi. 15, where since Luzzatto many expositors alter בעִים into בעֵצִים.

Jer. xxiii. 29 יִפְּצֵן סֵלַע וּכְפֹתֵי שָׁמַיִם. Everybody feels how halting the word כֵּה<sup>3</sup> is, and that the parallelism here demands a verb. I consider כֵּה a mistake for כָּהַ<sup>4</sup> (either through bad copying or bad reading), which would suit the context splendidly: "Doth not my word cause burning wounds like fire, and cleave rocks as a hammer?" The Kal כָּהַ happens indeed not to occur in the Old

<sup>1</sup> *KAT.*<sup>3</sup>, 507 ff.    <sup>2</sup> Cf. my essay, *Zur Erkl. d. Psalm. Sal.*, p. 31, on ix. 5.

<sup>3</sup> without succeeding verb is found elsewhere only in the single passage Isa. xx. 6 כֵּה מִכְסֵי הָאָדָם.

<sup>4</sup> Perf. propheticum with succeeding imperf. (*Ges.-Kautsch*<sup>27</sup>, 311, § 106 n.)

Testament, but is verified in the Mishna and in the dialects, and is confirmed besides by the derivatives *מכונה* and *כוייה*. On the expression cf. Isa. xliii. 2 *לא חכיה אש* *במו חלך*, and Lev. xiii. 24 *מכות אש*. The versions already had our text, but the Pesh. supplied a verb itself, *אן פלחח אש* *למא נאן נפח*. Duhm wishes to conclude from *כה* that the passage is a quotation, as the prophet would not have said *כה* if he had continued in the course of his own speech. Perhaps the superfluous *ו* in *הלוא* has fallen out from *כזה* in such a way that one copyist wrote the *ו* above *כה* as supplement, whilst a later wrongly inserted it in *הלוא*.

Jer. xxxviii. 11 *אֶל־תַּחַת הָאוֹצֵר*. It is difficult to understand how the "old cast clouts" were found *under* and not *in* the "treasury." Although LXX and Pesh. already read *תחת*, *אל*, I should like to see therein an old error for *מִלְתַּחַת*. Then *מלתחת* would be the "clothes-chamber of the treasury." It is well known that in 2 Ki. x. 22 *מלתחה* stands specially for the royal clothes-chamber. Perhaps the original text ran *בית המלך מלתחת*, which later received a gloss in the form of *האוצר*. Thus the origin of the Massoretic reading would be easily explained, and the Pesh. would also become intelligible: *סכך חסון? אגסא מן חמ סכך*.

The gloss *האוצר* then fell into the text in front of *בית המלך* *מלתחת* in the copy of the Pesh.

Jer. lii. 3 (= 2 Ki. xxiv. 20) *וביהודה בירושלם היתה ה' אף על* cannot be explained philologically. Nor is the parallel passage 2 Ki. xxiv. 3 *היתה ביהודה ה' אף על* any more intelligible, where the versions likewise read *על אף*. I propose in both passages to read: *על אף ה' וגו'* "For the anger of the Lord arose against Judah." The expression would then be quite like Ps. lxxviii. 21 *עלה אף* *בירשאל*, *ibid.* 31 *עלה בהם* *ואף אלהים*. cf. also 2 Chr. xxxvi. 16 *על אף חמת ה' בעמו*, and 2 Ki. xxiii. 26 (in similar context) *אשר חרה אפו ביהודה*. The origin of the error in our passage I explain as arising from the fact that a copyist wrote as a parallel on the margin<sup>1</sup>, Jer. xxxii. 31 *העיר הזאת לי העיר חמתי* *כי על אפי ועל חמתי היתה לי העיר הזאת*. From this passage both *על* for *עלה* and the superfluous *היתה* have crept into our verse.

Ezek. xxxii. 2 *ותנח בנְהִירְתֶּיךָ ותולח מים ברגלך ותרפש בנְהִירְתֶּם*. For *בנהריתך*, which is already supported by the versions, I conjecture *בנְהִירְתֶּךָ* "by thy snorting." The false reading probably arose under

<sup>1</sup> The parallel was all the more suggested, as the concluding words there too *מני מעל* suit the following words in our verse *על השליכו מעל פניו*.



the influence of the following **נהרתם**. Only by the alteration to **בנהרתך** is a good parallelism restored. On this passage cf. Job xl. 23, where we likewise find the expression **אל פיהו יגיה ירדן** אל used of the *Behemot*.

Psalm lxviii. 5 **סלו לרכב בערבות ביה שמו ועלו לפניו** 5. The difficult **ביה** is perhaps only an old mistake for **בציה**, which originally should be a gloss to **בערבית**, cf. infra on lxviii. 19. Instead of **שמו** I propose to read **שמוח**, which would give a good parallelism.

Ps. lxviii. 19 **ואף סוררים לשכן יה אלהים** is clearly a variant to v. 7 **אך סוררים שכנו צחיה**, which has crept into this passage by mistake. I therefore conjecture that we should read **לשכן ציה**, as **ציה** is a synonym for **צחיה**, to which it was added as explanatory gloss<sup>1</sup>. The mistake **יה** for **ציה** must have arisen at a time when the ancient Hebrew writing was still in use, in which **צ** and **י** are very similar, so that one at the side of the other could easily slip out. In a similar way may be explained Ps. lv. 4, where many exegetes, according to the parallelism, alter **עקת** into **צעקת**: the **צ** fell out after the **י** of **מפני**. Cf. also Prov. vi. 5, where we should read **מציז** for **מיר** (*Analekten*, 52), and above on Jer. x. 4 and Ps. lxviii. 5.

Prov. xxii. 20 **הלא כתבתי לך שלשים במועצות ודעת** (thus Keri) should perhaps be punctuated **שלשים** “Have I not written for thee thirty (chapters) of counsel and knowledge?” It would then be a reference to the number of chapters in Proverbs, which is thirty-one in our version, whilst the LXX (owing to transpositions) only has twenty-nine. But if, in the LXX, we separate the last twenty-two verses (the alphabetical praise of the virtuous woman) from chap. xxix, with which they evidently have no connexion, and which also stands alone in M.T., we get thirty chapters.

Job xxx. 14 **כפרץ רהב יאתיו תחת שאה התגלגלו** is an inexplicable figure. How can an advancing army be compared to a wide breach? The parallel **שאה** shows that some elemental force must have been named. I therefore read **כפרץ רהב** “like the bursting of the flood<sup>2</sup>.” **רהב** in this sense is found also in xxvi. 12 (perhaps also ix. 13) and Ps. lxxxix. 11. On the expression **פרץ רהב** cf. 2 Sam. v. 20; 1 Chr. xiv. 11, which has an allegorical application as in our passage.

FELIX PERLES.

Königsberg i. Pr., 10 Sept., 1905.

<sup>1</sup> The unintelligible **אלהים** at the end is explained most naturally by the beginning of ver. 8: the marginal gloss, owing to some mistake, attracted this **אלהים** also to our passage.

<sup>2</sup> In the Assyrian inscriptions too the advance of the armies is described as *kimā riḫilti*, “like an overflowing.”